UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/544,194	08/02/2005	Pavlo Barvinko	NL 030116	8365
	7590 08/25/201 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		ANYIKIRE, CHIKAODILI E		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Арі	olication No.	Applicant(s)				
		10	544,194	BARVINKO ET AL.				
		Exa	miner	Art Unit				
		СН	KAODILI E. ANYIKIRE	2621				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communion r Reply	cation appears	on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSIO	AILING DATE of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Inication. utory period will appoint, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUNICATIO In no event, however, may a reply be ti y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror the application to become ABANDON	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <i>6/14/2010</i>						
•		b)∏ This actio						
′=	Since this application is in condition f	or allowance e	xcept for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the	e merits is			
<i>/</i> —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the ap	oplication.						
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🖂	6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ion and/or elec	ction requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner						
-	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 August 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)🛛	Acknowledgment is made of a claim f	or foreian prio	itv under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).				
	☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		,	., (, (.,.				
/•	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)				
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P1	O-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	Date				
_	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	ratent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/544,194 Page 2

Art Unit: 2621

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is responsive to application number (10/544194) filed on August 2, 2005. Claims 1-17 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 14, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Koike does not teach different operating modes (Remarks of June 14, 2010, page 5 lines 20 -21). Further, the applicant does not believe that the reading of an analog signal being process by an A/D converter and a digital signal being converted by a D/A converter is a proper reading of the claims (Remarks of June 14, 2010; page 6 lines 31 – page 7 lines 8). The examiner respectfully disagrees. The term "operating mode" does not limit what the operation can be and further it is dependent and the switch between which operation happens based on the type of signal received an analog or a digital.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/544,194 Page 3

Art Unit: 2621

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koike et al (US 2002/0191955, hereafter Koike).

As per **claim 1**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus comprising a first input for receiving at least a first input signal of a first type (Fig 1 element 24; paragraph [0048]);

a second input for receiving at least a second input signal of a second type different than the first type (Fig 1 element 44; paragraph [0055]);

means for operating in a first operating mode when no input signal is detected on the second input (paragraph [0047]); and

means for operating in a second operating mode having different functionality than the first operating mode when an input signal is detected on the second input (paragraph [0047]; Koike discloses that depending on the signal whether it is digital or analog (i.e. video) the signal processor converts the signal to the opposite signal).

As per **claim 2**, A video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the different functionality comprises different video recording functionality.

As per **claim 3**, A video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the first and second operating modes have different video editing functionality.

As per **claim 4**, A video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the second operating mode is a video archiving mode.

As per **claim 5**, A video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the apparatus has hardware limitations that cause a first functionality limitation on signals of the first type and a second functionality limitation on signals of the second type and the functionality of the first operating mode meets that of the first functionality limitation and the functionality of the second operating mode meets that of the second functionality limitation.

As per **claim 6**, A video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 5 wherein the hardware limitation is a computational resource limitation.

As per **claim 7**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the second type of input signal comprises additional information not present in the first type of input signal and the second mode comprises functionality using this additional information (paragraph [0049]).

As per **claim 8**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the different functionality comprises different input signal selection functionality (paragraph [0049]).

As per **claim 9**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 8 further comprising means for selecting an input signal and wherein the first operation mode allows only selection of an input signal associated with the first input (paragraph [0043]).

As per **claim 10**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 9 wherein the means for selecting are operable to skip the input signals associated with the second input when in the first operating mode (paragraph [0043]).

As per **claim 11**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 10 wherein the selection means comprises a selection carousel which in the first operation mode includes only input signals associated with the first input (paragraph [0043]).

As per **claim 12**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 8 wherein the selection means is operable to only select the second input signal when in the second mode (paragraph [0049]).

As per **claim 13**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the first type of input signal is an analogue type of input signal and the second type of input signal is a digital type of input signal (paragraph [0043], [0047], and [0049]).

As per **claim 14**, Koike discloses a video recording apparatus as claimed in claim 13 wherein the second type of signal is a digital video (DV) signal (paragraph [0055]).

Regarding **claim 15**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable for claim 15.

As per **claim 16**, Koike discloses a computer program enabling the carrying out of a method according to claim 15 (paragraph [0038]).

As per **claim 17**, Koike discloses a record carrier comprising a computer program as claimed in claim 16 (paragraph [0038]).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272 - 7905. The fax

Application/Control Number: 10/544,194 Page 7

Art Unit: 2621

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Chikaodili Anyikire/ Patent Examiner AU 2621